



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 21, 2005

Mr. Bob Schell
Assistant District Attorney
Dallas County
411 Elm Street, Suite 500
Dallas, Texas 75202-3384

OR2005-03448

Dear Mr. Schell:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 222597.

Dallas County (the "county") received eight requests for a copy of a report evaluating the health services in the county jail and one request for "a complete copy of the UTMB report to Dallas County, Texas about jail staffing issues made late 2004 [sic]." The county did not submit the requested UTMB report regarding jail staffing issues. Therefore, we assume the requested report has been released to the extent it exists. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The county has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The county must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

You inform us, and have submitted documentation showing, that a suit was filed in federal court against the county on December 30, 2004 alleging a failure by the county to provide adequate health services to inmates of the county jail. Accordingly, we find that litigation was pending as of the date the first of the eight instant requests was received. Further, we conclude that the information at issue, consisting of a draft report and a report that has yet to be finalized, directly relates to the pending litigation. Therefore, the county may withhold the requested information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982). Because our ruling on this issue is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days.

Id. § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Amanda Crawford". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name and title.

Amanda Crawford
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AEC/sdk

Ref: ID# 222597

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jim O'Neill
Dallas Morning News
508 Young Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Laurance L. Priddy
Regional Managing Attorney
Advocacy, Incorporated
1420 West Mockingbird Lane, Suite 450
Dallas, Texas 75247
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. PJ Ward
Field Producer
WFAA-TV
606 Young Street
Dallas, Texas 75202-4870
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Holman Barr
Burt Barr & Associates, L.L.P.
203 East Colorado
Dallas, Texas 75203
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Liston Radney
Rich & Associates, L.L.C.
3500 Oak Lawn Avenue, Suite 510
Dallas, Texas 75219
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Daniel Montes
823 Ranch Road 12
San Marcos, Texas 78666
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Catherine Cuellar
KERA Unlimited
3000 Harry Hines Boulevard
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Edward H. Moore
The Cochran Firm
3811 Turtle Creek Boulevard, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75219
(w/o enclosures)